

REMARKS*In the Drawings*

In response to the Examiner's objection, Applicant hereby submits 8 Sheets of Replacement Formal Drawings. The replacement sheets are marked as "Replacement Sheets".

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 36, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Junya* (U.S. Patent No. 5,469,564). Claims 56-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Davis* (U.S. Patent No. 6,633,981).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection of the claims of the present application for the reasons set forth in the previous response as well as others. In the interest of expediency, Applicant has canceled the rejected claims 1, 2, 36, 37, and 56 – 59. Applicant reserves the right to file a continuation application to pursue prosecution of these claims.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6-11, 13, 16-25, 27-29 and 42-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Davis* (U.S. Patent No. 5,844,986), *Davis* (U.S. Patent 6,633,981) and Official Notice as detailed in Office Action. Claims 3-5 and 38-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Junya* as applied to claims 1 and 36, *Davis* '981 and Official Notice as detailed in Office Action.

Applicant assumes that the rejection of claim 27 is a typographical error since the Examiner also states that claim 27 was objected to and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection of the claims of the present application for the reasons set forth in the previous response as well as others. In the interest of expediency, Applicant has canceled the rejected claims 6 – 10, 16 – 22, 28, and 38 – 44. Applicant reserves the right to file a continuation application to pursue prosecution of these claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 45-55 were allowed.

Claims 14, 15, 26, 27 and 30-35 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 11 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 14 and intervening claim 13. Claims 13 and 14 have been canceled without prejudice. Claim 15 has been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of base claim 11 and intervening claim 13.

Claim 23 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 26. Claim 26 has been canceled without prejudice. Claim 27 has been amended to include the limitations of base claim 23 and intervening claim 26.

Claim 30 has been amended to include the limitations of base claim 28. Claims 29 and 33 that depended on now canceled claim 28 have been amended to depend from amended claim 30.

CONCLUSION

For the above-described reasons, Applicant believes that the claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 312-2211. No new matter has been added by this amendment and response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/14/05

Kenneth W. Bolvin
Kenneth W. Bolvin
Reg. No. 34,125

Attorneys for Applicant
Leffert Jay & Polglaze
P.O. Box 581009
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1009
T 612 312-2200
F 612 312-2250